THE LORD'S SUPPER AND THE BREAKING OF BREAD

BB 41

A few Notes which reveal how grievously Christendom has erred
from the Scriptures in regard to these two Institutions.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The keeping of Sunday as "the Lord's Day", and the celebration of the "Lord's Supper" weekly on Sundays, constitute the two main props by which religious Christendom has maintained her existence since the Apostles departed. The Lord did not rise on a Sunday but in the first hour of Monday; and the only Lord's Day revealed in Scripture is the Sabbath of a thousand years during which the Lord will reign over the earth. In Isaiah 58. 13, God speaks of the Sabbath as "My holy day." To associate any particular day of the week with Christianity is a grievous error and contrary to the positive teaching of the Apostle Paul, who chides both Galatian and Colossian saints for keeping days. Religious Christendom indulges its religious flesh by appointing a day in which to perform its own religious rites, whether this be called "the Mass", "the Holy Communion" or "the Lord's Supper". *(See Galatians* 4. 10 & Colossians 2. 16.) We know of no occasion when one day of the week has any significance above another for a true believer in Christ, and it matters not on what day of the week the annual celebration of the Lord's Supper, the midnight celebration of the Resurrection, or Pentecost occur. The simple fact is that God fixed the Christian solar year at a length which exceeded an exact number of weeks by 1¼ days, so that the Church's anniversaries cannot recur on the same day of the week, except at certain intervals.

Before embarking on any remarks about the Lord's Supper, it is well to call attention to the fact, which can be easily proved, that God so acted as to cause the elect nation of Israel to keep a Sabbath and the monthly and annual feasts one day later than those appointed by the Law. To accomplish this, He allowed Israel to begin their months from the first appearance of the Moon, while He reckoned His months as beginning from the true New Moon which was about one day previous to the phasis. This meant that Israel's monthly and annual feasts were not as those of Jehovah, but were "feasts of the Jews" as they are called in John's Gospel. To preserve the holiness of the true Sabbath, God caused the Sun and the Moon to stand still (as recorded in Joshua X) for "a whole day." Knowing that Israel would reckon those 48 hours as one day, while He Himself regarded them as two days. Thereafter, Jehovah's Sabbath became Israel's Friday - the day upon which the Lord died. We thus see that when God detected the course that Israel would follow (see Ezekiel XX), He adopted a plan which preserved the sanctity of His Own sacred days and which kept the nation of Israel from desecrating these and thereby involving themselves in crimes which of necessity would draw down wrath upon their heads. A notable proof of what we are saying is found in the fact that the very Passover Supper at which the Lord instituted His own memorial Supper took place on Thursday, the 13th of Nisan in Israel's calendar, whereas the nation kept "the Jews' Passover" the next night which was their 14th of Nisan, a Friday.

If God so acted towards His people Israel, it will surprise no one to learn that He found a means of concealing from view the true facts concerning the Death and Resurrection of Christ, knowing, as He must have done, that religious Christendom would sink to lower depths of perfidy even than those to which the nation of Israel had sunk. To accomplish this He wrought another change in time when our Saviour was in the grave. The evidence of this is in the Scriptures but failure to discern it has caused Christendom to suppose that Christ rose from the dead on Sunday which day, from about the secdnd or third centuries, has been held by all Christians to possess the qualification which warranted its being called "the Lord's Day." This is a grievous error.

We now come to the question of the difference between the Lord's Supper and the Breaking of Bread. The main question, however, is, Does Holy Scripture reveal that the Lord's Supper - the memorial feast which He Himself instituted at the last Passover Supper - is to be celebrated annually, and not daily as the "breaking of bread" was, as recorded in Acts 2. 42, 46; or as on the occasion of the anniversary of the Resurrection in Acts 20. 7? If the Scriptures, by precept or apostolic practice, are to be our sole guide and we uninfluenced by the erroneous and universal practice of religious Christendom in this matter, it can be asserted that the Lord's purpose in instituting His memorial

Supper was that once a year, on the anniversary of the night of His betrayal, all His own in the world should meet together in companies in remembrance of Himself and of His Death and so remind the world that once again the anniversary had been reached of that fearful day in human history when Jew and Gentile in evil association rose up and put God's Son to death. Paul, by revelation from the Lord, declares concerning this annual memorial, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew (proclaim) the Lord's death till He come." ("As often as" ± "as many times as" - Liddel & Scott.)

The Lord's Supper therefore has to be viewed in two aspects, namely, as a memorial of Himself and His death, and as a pronouncement to the world that once again the anniversary of that event had been reached. One cannot doubt that with this it was intended that a public testimony should be given of the unity of the members of the Church which is Christ's Body, with the result that many would believe on Christ for salvation (John 17. 21).

No one could understand the purpose of the Lord in instituting His Supper without recalling the occasion of its institution and therefore of its relationship to the Passover which the Lord was then celebrating with His disciples. First, let this fact be noted. There are only two occasions recorded in the Bible when the Passover of Jehovah was kept on the true fourteenth of the first month. The first of these was the original Passover at the Exodus, on the night of Thursday, May 11th, B. C. 1639, and the second, that recorded in the three Synoptic Gospels when, on the Thursday night of April 30th, A. D. 33, the Lord sat down with the twelve disciples for the Passover Supper at which He presided as Host and after which He instituted the new memorial feast in the place of the Passover.

Let it be also remembered that when, on the occasion of the last Passover, the Lord sat down with His disciples at 6 P. M. on Thursday, April 30th, A. D. 33, 4000 years to a minute had passed from the Fall of Adam and from the start of the 6000 years of man's Redemption - a period which terminates at the opening of Christ's Millennial Reign, when also the earth will be redeemed from the bondage of corruption.

Precisely four days before the Lord took the last Passover, He had been set aside for death by the anointing performed by Mary of Bethany, as recorded in John XII. In every Sacred year the four days between the 10th and the 15th of Nisan were totally ignored in Redemption time, because Christ by His death as the Antitypical Lamb would so completely remove the sins of all God's people in the 4000 years as to make it appear as if they had never existed.

The Passover in Israel always looked back to the night of Israel's deliverance from Egypt, even as it looked on to the coming of the One Who was the Antitype of the Paschal Lamb, and the One Who would ultimately deliver Israel from all bondage to the Gentiles. The Lord's Supper carries us back in memory to the night of His betrayal and death when He delivered us from the bondage of our sins and slavery to Satan; it also carries us forward in thought to His Coming when our final redemption will be accomplished.

Everything connected with Israel, from the departure out of Egypt to the entrance into Canaan is typical of the Church in a spiritual sense. In I Cor. 10. 6, we read, "Now these things were our types" and again in verse 11, "Now all these things happened unto them as types."

THE LORD'S SUPPER

We will now pass on from these preliminary remarks to a detailed examination of what the Scriptures reveal concerning the Lord's Supper and that which is spoken of as the Breaking of Bread. To treat these two institutions as though they were one and the same is an inexcusable error and a shocking departure from the truth of Holy Scripture. We will first take the Lord's Supper for examination and in doing so we will pay exclusive heed to what we find in Holy Writ and eliminate from our minds the practice of this institution as now seen throughout the length and breadth of religious Christendom.

It is obvious that we must first go back and read that which

Matthew, Mark and Luke record concerning the occasion when the Lord instituted His Supper. Let us picture ourselves as among those who were present on this occasion. Let us remember again that as the Lord and the Apostles gathered in the upper room, four thousand years to the hour had passed from the day in the Garden of Eden when He was set apart for death as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world (see I Peter I. 18 to 20). The Lord Jesus was therefore present at this Passover as God's Passover Lamb and the Antitype of the one first slain in Egypt and those slain at every subsequent Passover in Israel, after having been kept for the four typical days, as commanded in the original instructions given by God to Moses, as recorded in Exodus 12. 3 to 6. As already remarked, precisely four days before this Passover an Israelite woman anointed the Lord and thus set Him apart for death as the Antitypical Paschal Lamb.

It needs no stretch of imagination to realize the immense significance of this Passover Feast when the great Antitype - the Lamb of God - was present, ready to be offered in order to take away the sin of the world. Year by year, since the institution of the Passover in Egypt on May 11th, B. C. 1639, the nation of Israel had kept this feast as a memorial of the first Passover when they were delivered out of the hand of the Egyptians and when, on account of the sprinkled blood of the lamb on the lintel and the two door posts of their houses, they were sheltered from the judgment which fell upon the first-born of man and beast throughout the land of Egypt. Every Passover in Israel had looked on to the occasion when One would come, namely the Lamb of God, Whose sacrifice of Himself would accomplish their final deliverance as God's redeemed people. On the occasion of the Last Supper the Lamb of God was present, ready to be offered. Consequently, when the Lord sends the two disciples to prepare the Passover, He tells them to say to the owner of the house, "My time is at hand, I will keep the passover at thy house with My disciples" (Matt. 26. 18).

We must at this point face that which to our natural minds is a great difficulty. We can, however, use the occasion to much benefit by learning in reality the truth uttered by the prophet Isaiah on God's behalf when he declared, "For My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are My ways your ways, saith the Lord."

The difficulty to which we refer is this. The Lord did not actually die at this Passover feast which in accordance with the Law was at even on the true 14th day of the first month when the Paschal lamb had to be sacrificed. He actually died the next day at 3 p. m., which was the true 15th day of the first month. His actual death was therefore as the Sin-Offering of that day named in Numbers 28. 17 to 22.

The Lord, as common sense declares, could only die once in the literal sense and the infinite wisdom of God ordained that this should be as the Sin-Offering of the 15th of Nisan. It was only thus that it could be written, "He, Who knew no sin, was made sin for us" (II Cor.5. 21). As the Lord could literally die once only and *therefore literally* fulfil one type only, what is to become of *all the other types, such as* the Paschal offering, the Burnt Offering, and the Trespass Offering, etc., etc? *Are they to pass away without any antitypical counterpart to give them reality?* God forbid, we may well reply to such an appalling suggestion. How then did God meet the difficulty? Before answering, let us recall a statement in Romans 4. 17, wherein God is referred to as the One "Who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were." The difficulty which we are discussing is perfectly met for every spiritual mind (though certainly not for any carnal mind because of its insubjection to the law of God - Rom. 8. 7) when God is known to the heart as the One Who "calleth those things which be not as though they were."

In the twenty-four hours between 6 p. m. on April 30th and 6 p. m. on May 1st, A. D. 33, just prior to which hour the sacred body of our Lord was taken down with loving hands from the Cross and laid in the sepulchre, He had, according to God the Father, fulfilled to perfection but in a figurative sense, the Antitype of the Paschal Offering, the Burnt Offering, the Trespass Offering and the Peace Offering; and in a literal manner, the Sin Offering. His actual death as the Sin Offering sealed the reality of each figurative offering made by the Lord in that twenty-four hours to which we have just referred. It may help us better to understand the principle involved by quoting the Scripture which refers to the offering up of Isaac. We read in Hebrews 11. 17, "By faith Abraham when he was tried, offered up Isaac . . . his only-begotten son . . . accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure." In this case, as in the precious instance of the Saviour's figurative death as the Passover Lamb, God accepted the will for the deed.

When the Lord Jesus sat down at even with the twelve Apostles to take the Passover, He presented Himself before God the Father as ready to be offered. He was God's foreordained Lamb and the time for His sacrifice as such had come. He therefore offers up Himself to God Who knew His heart and His willing acceptance of death. His offering is accepted by God just exactly as if He had been literally slain and had given up His body and shed His blood for our redemption. *In the estimate* of the One Who "calleth ~~the~~ these things which be not *as though they were,*" Jesus the Lamb of God had died and fulfilled the antitype of every Paschal offering that had been made in Israel since their deliverance *from Egypt.*

These facts are all blessedly brought out and confirmed by the Saviour's own words when, viewing Himself as the One Who had already died as the antitypical Paschal Lamb, He says to His disciples when instituting His memorial Supper (in reference to the bread and the wine), "This is my body" and "this is my blood." Verily He could not offer these symbols of His body and His blood if He did not view Himself as being dead. The life is in the blood, Scripture declares. If, therefore, the blood had been shed, the life must have been given. To the carnal mind all this may be an unfathomable mystery, but to the spiritual mind it is a blessed fact which cannot be gainsayed or resisted.

Let us return to the Supper Table and in doing so view the Lord Jesus as having in figure died as God's Passover Lamb. We must not picture Him now as in figure risen. Rather let our thoughts go back to Egypt and let us behold an Israelitish family gathered together at the first Passover, feeding upon a lamb which had been roast with fire and unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Let us remember that the blood of that lamb had been obediently sprinkled on the lintel and the two door posts. There certainly could be no question in the minds of those Israelites as to whether their lamb had been slain or not. The fact was self-evident as they were eating the body of the lamb and knew well that its blood had been shed and sprinkled on the outside of the house as their sole protection from the judgment of the destroying Angel.

How these facts illuminate events at the last Passover when Jesus, the Lamb of God, is present and is able (in figure having died) to offer not, of course, His actual flesh and blood but bread and wine as symbols of these.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

Matthew XXVI. 26-28; Mark XIV. 22-25; Luke XXIII. 14-20;
I Corinthians V. 6-8; X. 16-21; XI. 17-34.

Let the above-named Scriptures be read so as to be in mind as we *proceed* with this paper. The accounts given in Matthew, Mark and Luke, it will be noted, contain only slight variations.

It is while the Paschal Supper is proceeding that Jesus "took bread, and gave thanks and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is My body, which is given for you: this do in remembrance of Me" (Luke). Matthew and Mark preface this statement with the words "take, eat," but they omit the words, "which is given for you" and, "this do in remembrance of Me." Obviously, the three statements are complementary one to another; the same applies to the giving of the cup which the Saviour declares "is the New Covenant in My blood which is shed for you." It would be well to note the manner in which Paul who receives a special revelation from the Lord confirms in I Cor. XI. the account given in Luke. It will be noted that both in reference to the bread and the wine the words "in remembrance of Me" are used. This fact manifestly marks the Lord's Supper as being a memorial feast.

The question before us is, What was the Lord's purpose in instituting this memorial feast? This can be easily answered if we can eliminate from our minds what religious Christendom has done in the matter. The

Passover in Israel was an annual memorial feast recalling the first Passover in Egypt immediately following which the Lord God brought that nation out with mighty signs and wonders. The Passover therefore was a memorial of an event - an event which was to have an antitype when Jesus the Lamb of God came into the world. This was fulfilled at the Last Supper when figuratively Jesus died - He being the true Passover Lamb. The Lord on this occasion spoke as follows concerning the Passover, "I will not eat any more thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God" (Luke). From these words it is clear that the Lord would recognize no Passover until He returned and restored the Kingdom to Israel. That return might have been immediate if the nation of Israel had responded to Peter's offer of the same (Acts III.) if they would repent of having rejected and crucified their Messiah.

The Passover, which was a memorial of the type (see Exodus 12. 14, and 13. 2), was therefore finished with, pending *the coming of the* Kingdom. Could it be that there was to be no memorial of the Antitype? *That question* is answered once and for ever by the act of the Lord *Jesus* in the giving of the bread and the wine to His disciples and saying, "This do in remembrance of Me." For ever, therefore, is the fact established that if the Passover was a memorial of an event, namely, the deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Egypt, the Lord's Supper is the memorial of a Person - the Lamb of God Who at the Paschal Feast when the Supper was instituted, offered Himself without spot to God and was accepted as the true Paschal Lamb. We thus see that the Lord's Supper, as it is called by Paul in I Corinthians XI, takes the place of the Paschal Supper which was put away until the Kingdom of God should come.

The question we have to consider is, What does Scripture teach concerning the time when the Lord's Supper should be taken?

It is a fact of transcendent significance that Holy Scripture records no instance when the Lord's Supper was partaken of other than the occasion of its institution by the Lord, as recorded in the Gospels. As all know, Scripture teaches either by precept or by practice.

Religious Christendom has almost from the beginning treated "the Lord's Supper" and the "Breaking of Bread" as one and the same event. Consequently, because the "breaking of bread" took place daily, as recorded in Acts II, it has been supposed that it was in order to take the Lord's Supper with equal frequency. By accepting the erroneous translation of the Greek words TE MIA TŌN SABBATŌN as "the first day of the week", instead of "the first (day) of the sabbaths" [i.e. the first day of the seven sabbaths or weeks between the Resurrection and Pentecost (Leviticus XXIII)] which appears in the Gospels as the day of Christ's Resurrection, ~~and~~ as also in Acts XX and I Cor. XVI,] religious Christendom has built an edifice of false traditions which will constitute an eternal monument to its ignorance of Holy Scripture. With this inexcusable error as its authority, religious Christendom professes to celebrate the Lord's Supper every Sunday - the day which it calls the Lord's Day because it is supposed that in it the Lord rose from the dead. We therefore hear of people in the assemblies of Christendom proclaiming that on "the Lord's Day" they assemble around "the Lord's Table" to take "the Lord's Supper." It would be difficult to find such a hopeless confusion of ideas as this in any other sphere. Nevertheless, taking the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion as it is called, every Sunday morning is the main stay and centre of the religious life of most sects, both Protestant and Catholic - the latter calling the Lord's Supper "the Mass."

We will presently set forth the clear teaching of Scripture in reference to the "Breaking of Bread." It will then be seen that though bread is broken at the Lord's Supper, it has little or nothing to do with the "breaking of bread" or "love feasts" referred to in Scripture.

We return again to the question, What does Scripture teach concerning the time for the observance of the Lord's Supper? The answer is that it teaches that the Lord's Supper must only be taken once a year on the anniversary of the night of His betrayal, when the Supper was instituted, following His death in figure as the true Paschal Lamb of God. In the long transitional era between the rejection of the nation of Israel and its restoration in the Kingdom of God - and in the place of the Passover which was then set aside - true believers in the Lord Jesus would gather in companies (one only in each locality) in the evening of the day in the Solar Calendar (then operative throughout the civilized world) which was the true anniversary of the day when the Lord instituted the Supper. They perfectly understood from His words that there would be no more Paschal feasts until the Kingdom and they knew that the Lord was instituting another Feast to take its place. If the Passover was an annual memorial of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, the Lord's Supper would be an annual memorial to the One Whose Body was given and Whose Blood was shed to redeem us from sin and bondage to Satan and the world.

Furthermore, the Law of God demanded (with penalties for failure) that the Passover should be killed "between the evenings" - that is, at sun-set (Deut. XVI. 6) on the 14th day of the first month. Apart from the fact that on certain conditions it could be taken on the 14th day of the second month, to take the Passover at any other time than at the appointed time would have been to incur the wrath of God.

Are we to suppose, because we live in the *day of grace*, that God has left it for us to decide when we should take the Lord's Supper? Or, does Scripture specify the time for this solemn event? The time is certainly revealed in Holy Scripture, but because of the perfidy of religious Christendom it has remained in concealment throughout the centuries since the Apostles departed. God could on no account allow the unregenerate masses of nominal Christians who frequent Christendom's so-called "places of worship" to know the secret, lest they should desecrate and dishonour with their infamous notions the true anniversary of the day in which the Lord was crucified and at the opening of which (6 p. m.) He instituted His memorial Supper, following upon the last Passover.

Because the Lord is at hand and the Church which is His Body is about to be translated, it has pleased God again to reveal the truth as to the date in the Solar calendar when the Lord's Supper was instituted. The reason for this, we believe, is that once again before its removal from the earth, companies of God's children in each locality may meet together and for the last time take the Lord's Supper in the appointed way and on the appointed day as that practised by our fellow-believers in the first century.

The Lord took the Paschal Supper with the twelve Apostles on the night of Thursday, April 30th, A. D. 33. Because of the ~~the~~ change in time wrought by God when Jesus was in the Grave (details of this will be found elsewhere), anniversaries have to be reckoned as one day less in our Gregorian calendar. Thus, the true anniversary of the Last Supper is the evening of our April 29th which is the true and only time to celebrate the Lord's Supper.

It matters not one jot or tittle what day of the week April 29th occurs upon. Obviously, it will be a different week-day every succeeding year.

Now let us look at the passage in I Cor. XI, beginning at the 23rd verse. Notice how Paul claims the direct authority of the Lord for what he is about to record, and remember also that this was given to Paul for ~~us~~ ~~the~~ us who are Gentiles so that we might know that the Lord's Supper was not, like the Passover, ~~a~~ an exclusively Jewish institution, *but given for all* believing Gentiles as well, that is, *for every member of the Body of* Christ - whether Jew or Gentile, male or female.

In reading what the Lord told the Apostle Paul, let us bear in mind that believers in Paul's day had never heard of anyone taking the Lord's Supper other than on the night which is the anniversary in the Solar calendar of the occasion of its institution. The Lord therefore reminds the Apostle of this occasion by naming it as the night of His betrayal - an event which we know took place after the Lord and His disciples had left the upper room. There would have been little object in the Lord naming that night as part of His instructions if it had no bearing upon the time when His Supper was to be taken. The word "same" is an uncalled-for interpolation which is not found in the texts. This also applies in verse 24 where the words "take, eat", as well as the word "broken", are not found in the original texts.

It is most important to remember that the expression, "This cup is the new testament (covenant) in My blood", which appears here and in the three Gospels, is of great significance. To understand this we have to turn to the prophecy found in Jeremiah XXXI. In verse 31 we read, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." The whole passage needs to be read to verse 34, as in it God reminds Israel of the covenant He made with them when He brought them out of Egypt and which they had broken. That covenant was based upon the blood-shedding of the typical Paschal lamb on the day of the Exodus (Exodus 19. 5). The New Covenant to which the Lord made reference when He presented the wine at the institution of His Supper is founded upon the shedding of His own Precious Blood, "shed for many for the remission (i.e. forgiveness) of sins." Thus it is that in Jeremiah 31. 34, the Lord is able to say to Israel in speaking of the New Covenant, "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." We who are Gentiles can thank God with full hearts that we also are brought into relationship with Himself on the ground of the New Covenant, a subject which is developed for us in *chapter IX of* the Hebrew Epistle and in which Christ is *presented as the Mediator* of the New Covenant.

Before passing on, let us remind ourselves that Israel's final restoration and forgiveness, just like our own reconciliation to God, is made possible only through the shedding of the precious Blood of Christ their Messiah "as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" and "Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God."

Before departing from the passage in I Cor. XI, we must call attention to the words in verse 26, "For as often (or, as many times) as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's death till He come." The expression "as oft as" appears in the previous verse with reference to the taking of the cup. It might be thought by some that these words imply that the Lord's Supper may be taken at any time. They have of course no such meaning, but merely remind the Corinthian saints who had been taking the Lord's Supper in an unworthy manner that it should be remembered on each occasion that the Supper is in remembrance of the Lord and an announcement to the world that once again the anniversary of His death had come round. Anniversaries are of God's creation, as may be clearly seen in the many annual feasts in the Levitical economy, such as the Passover. These were founded upon a soli-lunar calendar. It was God Himself Who ordained for the Christian Church that on the anniversary of the night of the Lord's betrayal the Church should take the Lord's Supper, and that on the anniversary of the midnight of His resurrection she should meet for "the breaking of bread" in the manner recorded of Paul and the Church at Troas in Acts XX. Furthermore, in this same chapter Paul proposes to be at Jerusalem for Pentecost - just as in I Cor. XVI he expresses his intention of tarrying at Ephesus until Pentecost, thereby clearly indicating that the Church at the beginning kept the anniversary of the descent of the Holy Ghost "when the day of Pentecost was fully come." We may well ask the solemn question, Is it within reason to suppose that God gave to the Church of Christ the keeping of the anniversaries of the Resurrection and the day when the Holy Ghost descended, while at the same time ignoring the anniversary of the day of Christ's death, in the first hours of which He instituted His memorial Supper? What meaning indeed, would the Feast of the Resurrection have if three days previously believers had not met together on the anniversary of the night of the betrayal to remember the Lord in His dying love for them, and to announce to the world the return of the day upon which it put Him to death?

The order of events, as ordained by God for the Church, is manifestly clear. Each year on the anniversary of the night of the betrayal (our April 29th) all believers in each locality met together to take the Lord's Supper in remembrance of His death. The next three days (April 30th, May 1st and 2nd) would be kept as a solemn season of remembrance and in the spirit of that which had passed before them when at the Lord's Table they had taken the Lord's Supper. Then at midnight of May 2nd the whole local Church would celebrate the Resurrection by "breaking bread" together.

It would be impossible to ignore the fact that all true believers whose hearts had been touched by the remembrance of what the Lord had passed through on those same days in the year A. D. 33, would wish in some measure at least to fast druing those three days. Church history makes it perfectly clear that this was the practice of many at the beginning. If any should introduce the quibble that there is no record of such things in the Scriptures, we must reply by saying again that there is no record of anyone taking the Lord's Supper in Scripture, except at its institution by the Lord Himself. Such a matter would surely depend upon the state of a person's heart which in turn would be affected by the measure of his love for our Lord and Master. Fasting could not be by the appointment of Scripture without introducing mere legality. In all such matters true believers would be guided individually by the Holy Spirit.

It is relevant to note that we learn from Acts XX, verse 5, that prior to the "first day of the SABBATHS ~~weeks~~" when at midnight the Church at Troas met to "break bread" in celebration of the Lord's resurrection, Paul and his company abode seven days. *This fact is clearly recorded for us to know that for one whole week prior to what Christendom calls* Easter, Paul and the company travelling with him remained in one place. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that it was prompted by a desire not to be occupied with travelling during the days which were the anniversaries of those between the anointing of the Lord by Mary of Bethany and His resurrection. How significant it is that no reference is made to the fact that the Church at ~~of~~ Troas took the Lord's Supper on the anniversary which must have occurred four days previously, in the evening of the fourth day of the seven. The reason the fact is not recorded is because it is obvious. The Bible never records the obvious except for a purpose. The reason the celebration of the Resurrection is recorded is because of the Eutychus incident of death and resurrection and because the whole episode is prophetic of the last occasion, before the Church's departure from the earth, when throughout the world believers will meet to break bread at midnight on May 2nd, the true anniversary of Christ's resurrection.

It is of surpassing interest to note that the two chapters, Acts XIX and XX, have been designed by the Spirit of God to form a miniature picture of the whole Christian dispensation from A. D. 33 - 36 to

A. D. 1933--1936 and on to 1950. This is not the occasion to develop such a matter. It is, however, important to note that the five and the seven days in Acts XX follow the "days of unleavened bread" as kept by the Jews. This is recorded to show that Christian anniversaries, such as the feast of the Resurrection which Paul and the Church at Troas kept at midnight, had no relationship to Jewish times. Had believers in the post-apostolic era noted this, the great controversies which then arose as to the time of the Christian festivals of Easter and Pentecost might have been avoided.

THE LORD'S TABLE

I Corinthians X. 16 to 21

At the last Passover, when the Lord instituted His Supper, He presided as Host, and this in spite of the fact that He was also God's Passover Lamb. It is the only occasion of its kind recorded when He acted as Host at His own table. *Paul in I Cor. X. sets forth the position of those who are partakers at the Lord's Table. Corinth was* a city given up to idolatry and he enjoins upon Corinthian believers the absolute necessity of keeping themselves from getting defiled by contact with idolators and idol worship. He says, "Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of demons." In verse 16 he clearly makes reference to the Lord's Supper, saying, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" The Apostle then shows that all true believers are one loaf, that is, one body, as typified by the one loaf used at the Lord's Supper. He shows that the whole company of the redeemed constitutes a single communion or fellowship founded upon the Blood of Christ and the Body of Christ.

What are we to understand by the expression (only once used), "the Lord's table"? This must refer primarily to the Lord's Supper when He would always be present as Host, but it must also apply to the every-day meal and the "breaking of bread" whensoever He is accorded His true place as Host. It is most blessed for believers to realise that every time they sit down at the table to partake of food for which they give thanks to God, the table may become the Lord's table at which He will preside as the Unseen Host. (I Cor: X. 31)

The solemn fact has to be faced that it would be well nigh impossible to find ~~the~~ a true Lord's Table set for the Lord's Supper anywhere in Christendom. All the sects have set up their own "tables" to which they welcome no one save those with whom they choose to walk because they hold views of Scripture similar to their own,,excluding all others in spite of the positive injunction, "Receive ye one another as Christ also received us, to the glory of God (Romans XV. 7) and again, "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye" (Romans XIV. 1).

We trust ere the Lord takes the Church to its heavenly home that He will slay with the sword of His lips the abominable sectarianism which divides believers one from another and thus accomplish the purpose for which we have been baptised by the Spirit into one body, for, says the Apostle, as already quoted, "We, being many *are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.*"

"CHRIST OUR PASSOVER"

It is absolutely vital that all present-day believers in the Lord Jesus Christ should realise that the slaying and eating of the Passover lamb in Israel and the seven days of unleavened bread which followed are a positive type of the Death ~~and~~ of Christ as our Passover Lamb and the Christian dispensation - the period of time which followed and which we are now in.

In I Cor. V. 7 & 8 we find the expression, "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast . . with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." In these words the Apostle positively links the Lord's Supper with the Passover. In fact, he goes further and ~~the~~ tells us that Christ is our Passover Lamb and that we, accepting Him as such, are to keep a continuing feast of unleavened bread. Not only are we to feed upon Christ in the Written Word, uncorrupted by the leaven of men's thoughts, but we ourselves are to be unleavened, that is, separate from evil.

It can assuredly be seen from this Scripture that at the Lord's Supper we view Christ as our Passover Lamb Who was sacrificed for us. To suggest therefore that we should take the memorial of His death at any other time than the anniversary of His death as such is unthinkable. It is in fact to make abortive the very purpose for which the Lord instituted the Supper. To take the Lord's Supper at other than on the anniversary of its institution is to deprive it of all its significance and to make it null and void, save as a meaningless feast of religious Christendom's own invention.

The fact is plain that the death of Christ and the Christian Dispensation which has followed it, constitute the true antitype of Israel's Passover and the seven days feast of unleavened bread.

THE BREAKING OF BREAD

The Scriptures contain many instances of the "Breaking of Bread," but on no occasion is it possible by any stretch of the imagination to link one of these occasions with the Lord's Supper.

We will think first of that blessed occasion when, having reached the village of Emmaus with the two disciples on the day of His resurrection, He went in with them to a house to partake of a meal. Quoting from Luke XXIV. 30 and 35, "As He sat at meat with them, He took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them . . . they told what things were done in the way, and how He was known of them in the breaking of bread." Without any desire to be facetious, may we ask the solemn question, Could anyone think for a moment that on this occasion the disciples were taking the Lord's Supper? To suggest such a thing would be to trifle in the most objectionable manner with the most sacred issues.

From this incident we learn that the Breaking of Bread may be an ordinary meal at which the ~~One~~ one presiding takes a loaf or cake, which in those days was always of a crisp nature, and breaks it after giving thanks to God. If we move on into the second chapter of Acts, we shall find a further confirmation of this fact. In verse 42 we read, "They continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and in fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers." Again, in verse 46, we read, "they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple and breaking bread from house to house (lit. at home) did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." These statements leave the unmistakeable impression that "the breaking of bread" as practised in those first days was simply the gathering of believers day by day in one another's houses for the purpose of taking food together as an act of fellowship, and doubtless on each occasion the host took a loaf and gave thanks to God in the presence of all, either at the beginning or during the course of the meal.

There can be no doubt that these community meals of the first Christians took place frequently as they provided an occasion for happy fellowship and spiritual intercourse, with the Lord Himself as central to all their thoughts and conversation. Doubtless these gatherings were along lines practised by the secular world when those able to do so brought food for the benefit of all present. In the secular world such a gathering would be called a "club feast".

It was obvious that Christians would *meet together for these* fellowship meals on any special occasion when it would be profitable and according to the mind of the Lord for them to do so. We have already called attention to Paul's visit to Troas, recorded in Acts XX, where we may learn a very important fact about apostolic practice. In Acts XX, verse 7, which we will quote with what is the literal rendering, we read, "On the first day of the sabbaths, we, having assembled to break bread, Paul, intending to depart on the morrow, discoursed to them and continued his speech till midnight." The key to the whole incident is the fact that the anniversary of Christ's resurrection on "the first day of the sabbaths" was at hand, and in accordance with Apostolic teaching and practice, all the believers in Troas met together during the evening of May 2nd, intending at or after midnight to "break bread," that is, have a fellowship meal together in celebration of the glorious resurrection of Christ. During the course of the evening (they probably met about 8 to 9 p. m.) the Apostle addresses the assembled company and continues talking right up to midnight. Then, omitting reference to the incident connected with Eutychus, we read in verse 11, the Apostle ~~Paul and his company~~ "broke the bread" and continued talking till daybreak. We thus learn that as soon as

As the anniversary of the Resurrection had arrived, the Apostle Paul and his company, and all the brethren and sisters in the Church at Troas, met in the house of one of their members. This house had a large third-floor loft or attic. Here arrangements were made for the fellowship meal which it was the habit of the first believers to partake of at the midnight of May 2nd. This was the opening hour of the resurrection day, our May 3rd, always referred to in the New Testament as "the first day of the sabbaths." This in A. D. 33 was not a Sunday, but a Monday, because of the change in time just wrought by God when our blessed Master's Spirit had taken flight, and when His sacred Body lay untenanted in the rock-hewn sepulchre, for three days and three nights (Matt XII-40)

How infinitely solemn it is that assemblies of believers all over the world have been taught by their leaders that it is right and proper in the light of Acts XX to come together on Sunday morning to take the Lord's Supper which is mistakenly called "the Breaking of Bread", and all this on the assumption that Paul and his company and all the assemblies of believers in Paul's day met every Sunday to take the Lord's Supper. The confusion of thought in this matter could not be more absolute. The truth is, there was at that time no such day as Sunday known to the Gentile churches and the week of seven days was unknown as a division of time in the Roman earth until centuries later, probably about the time of Constantine. The Roman month was divided, as all know, into three parts called Calends, Nones and Ides. The Greeks also divided their months into three periods of ten days.

It has been a commonplace of theology in the assemblies of Christendom for over a hundred years that the Lord rose from the dead on a Sunday and appeared in the evening to the Apostles and others, as recorded in Luke XXIV and John XX. It is then affirmed, in support of the contention that the Lord in resurrection set His seal on the keeping of the first day of the week, Sunday, that He appeared again the next Sunday evening when Thomas was present, because Scripture states that "after eight days again His disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus." If Scripture had said, "on the eighth day" instead of "after eight days", this calculation would have been justified, but "after eight days" must mean that eight days were completed before the next appearance of the Risen Saviour. How far the whole notion is from the truth can be realised when the fact is faced that the Lord rose after midnight on Sunday, that is, in the first hour of Monday, May 4th, in the evening of which day He first appeared to the company in the upper room. His appearing "after eight days" when Thomas was present must have been on Tuesday evening, May 12th, which is eight complete days of 24 hours each from the time of His first appearance. The meeting with Thomas who is a type of the unbelieving nation of Israel took place on the exact day of the completion of the 490 years, or Seventy Weeks, of Daniel IX, and it was to mark this occasion that the whole incident took place - Thomas fulfilling typically the repentance of Israel, as described in Zechariah XII. 10, when "they shall look upon me whom they have pierced" and when the 2,300 days ~~and the 1,335 days~~ of Daniel VIII ~~& XII~~ will reach their end and the full promise of Daniel IX. *24 be fulfilled.*

The theory therefore that the Lord after His resurrection appeared on two successive Sundays to His disciples has not one single word of Holy Scripture to support it. It is in fact a figment of human imagination prompted by a desire to support an article of religion which not only is unscriptural, but is anti-scriptural, as Paul by the Spirit in Galatians and the Colossian Epistle denounces the keeping of days.

CONCLUSION →

Religious Christendom from end to end has sought to make the Lord's Supper with its weekly celebration a cause of blessing, rather than an effect of blessing. Religious human nature finds it far less of a tax to do something than to be something. Consequently the Lord's Supper has been laid hold of and converted into a rite so disfigured and out of harmony with that which the Scriptures reveal, that it is unrecognisable, save in name. No one who understands the Lord's purpose in instituting this annual remembrance of His death would belittle its importance for a second, but for the sects of Christendom to turn it into a weekly or monthly institution and then make ~~it~~ this the focal point of Christian life and practice without one vestige of Scriptural authority is not only to overthrow the Lord's purpose in the Supper, but to lull to sleep the consciences of believers with the entirely false notion that to regularly take the Supper, Sunday after Sunday, carries with it the approval of the Lord and His blessing, when in fact the exact opposite is the case.

That true believers should meet together frequently, ~~daily~~, either on Sunday or any other day, ~~if~~ as convenient, to "break bread" has ~~the~~ full Scriptural authority, ~~and~~ Particularly ~~so~~ is this the case at midnight on the anniversary of the Lord's resurrection, as we learn from Acts XX. Most will wish to meet with fellow-believers to "break bread" on the Day of Pentecost (June 21st) or on any other anniversary, such as the Lord's birth (Oct. 29th) or His baptism (Oct. 5th). The "breaking of bread" on such occasions would be a plain fellowship meal, preceded or followed by ministry suited to the ~~occasion~~ event, with the Lord Jesus Christ central to the whole happy occasion.

Finally, we need to warn all, that in the revelation given to Paul by the Lord, as recorded in I Cor. XI, verses 27 to 34, sectarianism, that is, "not discerning the body", earns the severe rebuke of the Lord to the extent of bodily ailments, or even death itself. This shows both the importance of the Lord's Supper and the utter displeasure of the Lord towards those who negative its sacred purpose by adopting a sectarian spirit and so turning to mockery the one loaf which is at once a symbol of the Lord's Body that was given for us~~,~~ and of His mystical body - the Church - of which every true believer in Jesus is a member,

> "For we, being many, are ONE BREAD, and ONE BODY. For we
> are all partakers of that ONE BREAD" (I Cor. X. 17).